



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/717,004	11/19/2003	Brendan Clarke Fields	MS#303720.01 (5222)	7594

38779 7590 09/08/2006

SENNIGER POWERS (MSFT)
ONE METROPOLITAN SQUARE, 16TH FLOOR
ST. LOUIS, MO 63102

EXAMINER

BOTTS, MICHAEL K

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2176

DATE MAILED: 09/08/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/717,004

Applicant(s)

FIELDS ET AL.

Examiner

Michael K. Botts

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 June 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 2, 4, 6, 7, 14-18, 20-22, 26, 27, 29 and 30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 2, 4, 6, 7, 14-18, 20-22, 26, 27, 29, and 30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This document is a Second Non-Final Office Action on the merits. This action is responsive to the following communications: Amendment A, which was filed on June 28, 2006.
2. Claims 1, 3, 8-13, 23-25 and 31 are cancelled.
3. Claims 2, 4, 6, 7, 14-18, 20-22, 26, 27, 29, and 30 have been examined, with claims 4, 17, 18, and 26 being the independent claims.
4. Claims 2, 4, 6, 7, 14-18, 20-22, 26, 27, 29, and 30 are rejected.

Claims Rejections – 35 U.S.C. 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. **Claims 2, 4, 6, 7, 14-18, 20-22, 26, 27, 29, and 30** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by WebWasher, with its functionality as described by the combined references of: Bruce, B., "Our WebWasher Workshop," downloaded by the Examiner on September 9, 2006, from: web.archive.org, with pages dating prior to November 19, 2002, downloaded pages 1-95, [hereinafter "Bruce"].

Note that the claims below have been re-ordered to reflect their dependencies.

Regarding **independent claim 4**, Bruce teaches:

A method for blocking dereferencing elements in a message, the method comprising:

accepting a source file for the message;

identifying one or more elements within the message source file, wherein the elements specific references to sources of content to be dereferenced upon rendering of the message;

rewriting the references to the sources of content of the elements identified in the message source, wherein the rewriting of the references to the sources of content comprises replacing the reference to the source of content with a reference to an alternate source file;

passing the message source to a message display output; and

rendering the message in the message display.

(See, Bruce, pages 1-33 teaching accepting a source file for a message, identifying elements within the message source file wherein the elements reference sources of content to be dereferenced upon rendering of the message, taught as accepting messages and web pages with cookies, web bugs, web beacons, etc. See, Bruce, pages 24-33, teaching to rewrite the references of the sources of contents of the elements by replacing the reference to the source of content with a reference to an alternate source file, passing the message source to a display output and rendering the message in the display.)

Art Unit: 2176

Regarding **dependent claim 2**, Bruce teaches:

The method of claim 4 further comprising specifying a security policy setting, wherein the rewriting of the references to the sources of content is in accordance with the security policy setting.

(See, Bruce, pages 3-6, teaching setting a security policy with prior art browsers, and by setting a security policy by positively identifying which cookies to accept or reject.)

Regarding **dependent claim 5**, Bruce teaches:

The method of claim 4 wherein the alternate source file is a transparent image file.

(See, Bruce, page 19, teaching to replace blocked images with clear images.)

Regarding **dependent claim 6**, Bruce teaches:

The method of claim 4 wherein the message source file is a Hypertext Mark-up Language (HTML) document.

(See, Bruce, pages 3-33, teaching the message source file as an HTML document.)

Regarding **dependent claim 7**, Bruce teaches:

The method of claim 4 wherein the message display is an HTML rendering display.

Art Unit: 2176

(See, Bruce, page 20, teaching that the image may be at the choice of the user, including inherently HTML, which is ubiquitous with browsers and the internet. See also, Bruce, pages 30-31, teaching the use of "favicons" as replacement HTML displays.)

Regarding **independent claim 17**, Bruce teaches:

A method for blocking dereferencing elements in a message, the method comprising: accepting a source file for the message;
rendering the file in a first message display output;
grouping one or more elements within the rendered message into security level groups;
rewriting the elements to be processed through a protocol handler, wherein the processing of the elements by the protocol handler comprises returning information indicating that a target destination is not available;
passing the message source to a second message display output; and
rendering the message in the second message display.

(It is noted that a Web page may contain several elements to be dereferenced, known generally as cookies, web bugs, etc. See, Bruce, generally. It is inherent in the invention taught by Bruce that a distinction between cookies, etc., to be accepted and those to be redirected or blocked is a grouping of the elements.

See, Bruce, pages 3-33, teaching receiving and rendering a first message.

Art Unit: 2176

See, Bruce, pages 3-6, teaching setting a security policy with prior art browsers, and by setting a security policy by positively identifying which cookies to accept or reject.

See, Bruce, pages 21-27, teaching redirecting blocked URLs and a notice display.

See, Bruce, page 27, teaching to return a blank user information to websites, thereby indicating that a target destination is not available, and to display that message.)

Regarding **dependent claim 14**, Bruce teaches:

The method of claim 17 wherein the message source file is an HTML document.

(See, Bruce, pages 3-33, teaching the message source file as an HTML document.)

Regarding **dependent claim 16**, Bruce teaches:

The method of claim 17 further comprising specifying a security policy setting, wherein the processing of the elements by the protocol handler is in accordance with the security policy setting.

(See, Bruce, pages 3-6, teaching setting a security policy with prior art browsers, and by setting a security policy by positively identifying which cookies to accept or reject.)

Art Unit: 2176

Regarding **dependent claim 22**, Bruce teaches:

The method of claim 17 wherein the first and second message displays are HTML rendering displays.

(See, Bruce, pages 3-33, teaching the first and second message displays as an HTML document. See, Bruce, page 20, teaching that the image may be at the choice of the user, including inherently HTML, which is ubiquitous with browsers and the internet. See also, Bruce, pages 30-31, teaching the use of "favicons" as replacement HTML displays.)

Regarding **independent claim 18**, Bruce teaches:

A method for blocking dereferencing elements in a message, the method comprising:

accepting a source file for the message;

rendering the file in a first message display output;

grouping one or more elements within the rendered message into security level groups;

rewriting the elements to be processed through a protocol handler, wherein the processing of the elements by the protocol handler comprises redirecting to an alternate source file;

passing the message source to a second message display output; and rendering the message in the second message display.

(It is noted that a Web page may contain several elements to be dereferenced, known generally as cookies, web bugs, etc. See, Bruce, generally. It is inherent in the invention taught by Bruce that a distinction between cookies, etc., to be accepted and those to be redirected or blocked is a grouping of the elements.

See, Bruce, pages 3-33, teaching receiving and rendering a first message.

See, Bruce, pages 3-6, teaching setting a security policy with prior art browsers, and by setting a security policy by positively identifying which cookies to accept or reject.

See, Bruce, pages 21-27, teaching redirecting blocked URLs and a notice display.

See, Bruce, pages 24-33, teaching to rewrite the references of the sources of contents of the elements by replacing the reference to the source of content with a reference to an alternate source file, passing the message source to a display output and rendering the message in the display.

See, Bruce, page 27, teaching to return a blank user information to websites, thereby indicating that a target destination is not available, and to display that message.)

Regarding **dependent claim 15**, Bruce teaches:

The method of claim 18 further comprising specifying a security policy setting, wherein the processing of the elements by the protocol handler is in accordance with the security policy setting.

Art Unit: 2176

(See, Bruce, pages 3-6, teaching setting a security policy with prior art browsers, and by setting a security policy by positively identifying which cookies to accept or reject.)

Regarding **dependent claim 19**, Bruce teaches:

The method of claim 18 wherein the alternate source file is a transparent image file.

(See, Bruce, page 19, teaching to replace blocked images with clear images.)

Regarding **dependent claim 20**, Bruce teaches:

The method of claim 18 wherein the message source file is an HTML document.

(See, Bruce, pages 3-33, teaching the message source file as an HTML document.)

Regarding **dependent claim 21**, Bruce teaches:

The method of claim 18 wherein the first and second message displays are HTML rendering displays.

(See, Bruce, pages 3-33, teaching the first and second message displays as an HTML document. See, Bruce, page 20, teaching that the image may be at the choice of the user, including inherently HTML, which is ubiquitous with browsers and the internet. See also, Bruce, pages 30-31, teaching the use of "favicons" as replacement HTML displays.)

Art Unit: 2176

Regarding **independent claim 26**, Bruce teaches:

A method for blocking dereferencing elements in a message, the method comprising:

accepting a source file for the message;

rendering the file in a first message display output;

grouping one or more elements within the rendered message into security level groups;

rewriting the elements to be processed through a protocol handler, wherein the processing of the elements by the protocol handler comprises returning information indicating that a target destination is not available;

passing the message source to a second message display output;

rendering the message in the second message display;

combining a base Uniform Resource Locator (URL) and a relative URL into a full URL;

passing the full URL to be processed to a protocol handler; and

specifying a security policy setting, wherein the processing of the elements by the protocol handler is in accordance with the security policy setting.

(See, Bruce, pages 16-20, teaching to filter by URL, including by "base URL.")

Regarding **dependent claim 27**, Bruce teaches:

The method of claim 26 wherein the processing of the elements by the protocol handler comprises redirecting to an alternate source file.

Art Unit: 2176

(See, Bruce, pages 3-95 generally, and specifically 21-27, teaching redirecting URLs.)

Regarding **dependent claim 28**, Bruce teaches:

The method of claim 27 wherein the alternate source file is a transparent image file.

(See, Bruce, page 19, teaching to replace blocked images with clear images.)

Regarding **dependent claim 29**, Bruce teaches:

The method of claim 23 claim 26 wherein the message source file is an HTML document.

(See, Bruce, pages 3-33, teaching the message source file as an HTML document.)

Regarding **dependent claim 30**, Bruce teaches:

The method of claim 26 wherein the first and second message displays are HTML rendering displays.

(See, Bruce, pages 3-33, teaching the first and second message displays as an HTML document. See, Bruce, page 20, teaching that the image may be at the choice of the user, including inherently HTML, which is ubiquitous with browsers and the internet. See also, Bruce, pages 30-31, teaching the use of "favicons" as replacement HTML displays.)

Art Unit: 2176

It is noted that any citations to specific, pages, columns, lines, or figures in the prior art references and any interpretation of the references should not be considered to be limiting in any way. A reference is relevant for all it contains and may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art. See, MPEP 2123.

Conclusion

6. The following prior art is made of record and not relied upon that is considered pertinent to applicants' disclosure:

"Removing adverts from web pages," Flourish.org, published on the Web as of October 3, 2002, downloaded by the Examiner on September 4, 2006, from:
<http://web.archive.org/web/20021003023544/http://www.flouish.org/adremove>, pages 1-6.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael K. Botts whose telephone number is 571-272-5533. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 8:00-4:00 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on 571-272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Art Unit: 2176

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MKB/mkb

William S. Bashore
WILLIAM BASHORE
PRIMARY EXAMINER